June 1999
UM-P-99/17
RCHEP-99/06

Matter-affected neutrino oscillations in ordinary and mirror stars and their implications for gamma-ray bursts

Raymond R. Volkas and Yvonne Y. Y. Wong
School of Physics
Research Centre for High Energy Physics
The University of Melbourne
Parkville 3052 Australia
(r.volkas@physics.unimelb.edu.au, ywong@physics.unimelb.edu.au)

arXiv:astro-ph/9907161v1 13 Jul 1999

Abstract

It has been proposed that the annihilation process $\nu\overline{\nu} \to e^- e^+ \to \gamma\gamma$ may be responsible for the generation of gamma-ray bursts (GRBs). The incipient neutrino–antineutrino pairs carry virtually all of the gravitational binding energy available from the central engine. However, gamma-ray bursters proposed to date are inevitably surrounded by an excess of baryons, leading to the "baryon-loading problem". In the light of growing evidence for neutrino oscillations, we discuss the implications of matter-affected oscillations for GRB energetics, and on the viability of "mirror" stars as GRB progenitors.

I. INTRODUCTION

The ongoing quest for a complete understanding of gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) dates back to their fortuitous discovery in the 1960s [1]. Over the years, a class of models called the "fireball model", which seeks to explain the temporal structure of the bursts and the non-thermal nature of their spectra, has emerged [2]. In essence, the model consists of a sudden injection of radiative energy into a compact region with relatively few baryons ($\sim 10^{-5} M_\odot$), where an opaque $e^- e^+ \gamma$ plasma is consequently formed. This "fireball" expands relativistically, until internal processes [3] such as collisions within the now optically thin outflow trigger the reconversion of its kinetic energy to radiation. The photons then escape to infinity, to be hailed by us earthly inhabitants as a GRB. Subsequent deceleration of the relativistic fireball through interactions with the ambient interstellar medium gives rise to further emissions at longer wavelengths: the so-called afterglow [4].

Although the discovery of afterglows in the x-ray, optical and/or radio domains for several bursts in 1997 [5] are not greeted unanimously by the GRB community as signatures of the

classical fireball model [6], the observations have, nonetheless, established firmly for the first time the cosmological origin of GRBs. Redshifts of $z = 0.835$ and $z = 3.418$ were reported for two of the earliest observations respectively [7], and the recent measurement of $z = 1.600$ in the afterglow of GRB 990123 was performed with unprecedented accuracy [8]. The central engines that power each fireball have not yet been identified, though, at cosmological distances, these GRB progenitors must be capable of generating some $10^{51} \rightarrow 10^{53}$ ergs of energy in a short period of time. Prime candidates include binary neutron star merger [9] and its variants [10], and core collapse [11], in which the concomitant release of gravitational binding energy is almost entirely in the form of neutrinos and antineutrinos. In principle, about one thousandth of these neutrinos annihilate to form electron–positron pairs, and ultimately photons [12] via $\nu\overline{\nu} \rightarrow e^- e^+ \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, creating a plasma that is the fireball.[1] The major flaw, however, is that the nascent compact object is inevitably surrounded by an excess of baryons, which, if neutrino annihilation is to occur in this environment, would lead to formation of a nonrelativistic fireball that is inconsistent with observations. This is the "baryon-loading problem".

Following the recent announcement of very strong evidence for atmospheric neutrino oscillations at SuperKamiokande [14], a novel solution to the baryon-loading problem that exploits this simple quantum mechanical phenomenon has been put forward [15]. By invoking large amplitude oscillations between the muon neutrino ν_μ and a "sterile" neutrino ν_s with an oscillation length comparable to the width of the baryonic region, it has been proposed that a neutrino that begins as a ν_μ traverses the region largely as a ν_s, and converts back to ν_μ upon exit. The sterile neutrino is, by definition, inert. Thus annihilation does not take place inside the baryon-contaminated region, thereby preventing the formation of a dirty, nonrelativistic fireball. The ostensible efficiency of energy deposition is $\sim 10^{-2} \rightarrow 10^0$ relative to direct annihilation in the absence of baryons and oscillations, subject to the geometry of the GRB progenitor.

Although an attractive idea, the analysis in Ref. [15] fails to address two crucial issues: (i) If the central engines are indeed mergers and/or collapses, there is no reason to assume that only μ-type neutrinos are (thermally) emitted. Thus *all* neutrino flavours must individually oscillate into a sterile neutrino to substantially eliminate $\nu\overline{\nu}$ annihilation in the baryonic region. The conversion of ν_μ to ν_s (and their antiparticles) alone will not solve the baryon-loading problem. (The only way around this would be to hypothesise a different type of central engine that produced μ-type neutrinos entirely from pion decay.) (ii) Matter effects may significantly alter the oscillation pattern. Modifications to the effective neutrino masses and mixings due to interactions with the medium have, in the past, been studied extensively in various astrophysical and cosmological contexts. A notable example is the proposed MSW solution to the solar neutrino problem [16], in which matter effects inside the Sun are largely responsible for the depletion of the ν_e flux that impinges on Earth. Matter-affected oscillations may lay further claims on the generation of neutrino asymmetries in the

[1] Of course, the merger/collapse may possess sufficient rotational energy to power the fireball through the coupling of its angular momentum to a strong magnetic field [13]. This, however, is not the topic of this paper.

early universe [17], and the energetics of and r-process nucleosynthesis in Type II supernovae [18,19]. Gamma-ray burst progenitors are necessarily dense objects; it is thus our purpose to reassess the scenario presented in the said analysis in the light of matter-affected oscillations, and, more generally, to demonstrate the latter's importance in influencing the energetics of a neutrino-driven GRB.

Yet, the story does not end here. It has been suggested that GRBs may be attributed to the mergers/collapses of "mirror" stars composed of matter that is blind to ordinary interactions [20]. The accompanying mirror neutrinos may oscillate into ordinary neutrinos, whose subsequent annihilation will occur in regions with few *ordinary* baryons, thereby easily eliminating the baryon-loading problem. In this paper, we shall also examine this possibility more closely, taking into account the role of matter effects.

Before proceeding, we should note that one ought to have an open mind at this stage as to the mechanism by which GRBs are energised. Neutrino–antineutrino annihilation may well not be the sole means (or even *a* means) of achieving this end. Other forms of energy and energy extraction mechanisms, notably the exploitation of the compact object's spin energy through coupling to a strong magnetic field [13], have been proposed which may be complementary or alternative to the annihilation process. Be that as it may, neutrino kinetic energy is certainly a very important source to consider, given its function as dissipator of gravitational binding energy in mergers and collapses. If the neutrino is to play a role, its properties must be properly understood and its activities incorporated into prospective GRB models. These form the basis of the present work.

II. NEUTRINO OSCILLATIONS AND MATTER EFFECTS

Neutrino oscillations follow directly from non-degenerate neutrino masses and non-trivial mixing amongst the flavours. The former criterion ensures that each propagation eigenstate evolves with a distinct phase governed by its energy (and thus squared mass by $E = \sqrt{p^2 + m^2} \simeq p + \frac{m^2}{2p}$). Subsequent development of phase differences gives rise to the periodicity of the oscillation phenomenon, which, for neutrinos of momentum p in vacuum, is determined by the ratio $2\pi\frac{2p}{\Delta m^2_{ij}}$, where $\Delta m^2_{ij} = m^2_i - m^2_j$ is the squared mass difference between the ith and jth mass (propagation) eigenstates. The oscillation amplitude scales with the amount of mixing between the states. For a two-neutrino system, this is characterised by one mixing angle θ, such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\nu_\alpha\rangle &= \cos\theta|\nu_1\rangle + \sin\theta|\nu_2\rangle, \\ |\nu_\beta\rangle &= -\sin\theta|\nu_1\rangle + \cos\theta|\nu_2\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where ν_1 and ν_2 are the mass eigenstates, and the subscripts α and β label two different flavour eigenstates respectively. By the CPT theorem, the same oscillation parameters govern the flavour evolution of both neutrino and antineutrino systems in vacuum.

In the presence of matter, the neutrino gains an effective mass from interacting with the ambience [21]. The nature of the gain — its magnitude and sign — is subject to the density of the medium and the interaction channels that are available therein. Thus two oscillating neutrino flavours that interact differently with the environment will develop between them

a phase difference that is dissimilar to its vacuum counterpart, thereby modifying the oscillation length and, though somewhat less obviously from our qualitative discussion, the oscillation amplitude. For a two-neutrino system[2] in a *uniform* medium, the probability that ν_α will oscillate to ν_β, where $\alpha \neq \beta$, at time t is given by [22]

$$P(\alpha \to \beta, t) = \sin^2 2\theta_{\rm eff} \sin^2 \frac{\pi t}{\lambda_{\rm eff}}, \tag{2}$$

where the quantity $\lambda_{\rm eff} = 2\pi \frac{2E}{\Delta m^2_{\rm eff}}$ is the effective oscillation length, and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta m^2_{\rm eff} &= \Delta m^2_{\alpha\beta} \sqrt{\left(\frac{2EV_{\alpha\beta}}{\Delta m^2_{\alpha\beta}} - \cos 2\theta \right)^2 + \sin^2 2\theta}, \\ \sin^2 2\theta_{\rm eff} &= \frac{\sin^2 2\theta}{\left(\frac{2EV_{\alpha\beta}}{\Delta m^2_{\alpha\beta}} - \cos 2\theta \right)^2 + \sin^2 2\theta}, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

with $V_{\alpha\beta} = \Phi_\alpha - \Phi_\beta$, where Φ_α (Φ_β) is the matter potential for ν_α (ν_β), and we have used $E \simeq p$. Note that for clarity, all squared mass differences will now carry the subscripts $\alpha\beta$ (denoting flavours) such that $\Delta m^2_{\mu\tau}$, for example, corresponds to the squared mass difference between the two mass eigenstates relevant for the $\nu_\mu \leftrightarrow \nu_\tau$ system.

A typical celestial medium is an electrically neutral concoction of electrons/positrons and nucleons (both bound and free). Thus a ν_e propagating therein has both charged and neutral current interactions, while ν_μ and ν_τ have only the latter, and ν_s has none. To the lowest order in G_F, their respective matter potentials are

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_e &= \sqrt{2} G_F \left(N_e - \frac{1}{2} N_n \right) = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\rho}{m_N} \left(3Y_e - 1 \right), \\ \Phi_\mu &= \Phi_\tau = -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} N_n = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\rho}{m_N} \left(Y_e - 1 \right), \\ \Phi_s &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where G_F is the Fermi constant, N_e denotes the electron minus positron number density, N_n the neutron number density, ρ the nucleon density, m_N the nucleon mass, and Y_e the number of electrons per nucleon. Note that for antineutrinos, $\Phi_{\overline{\alpha}} = -\Phi_\alpha$, such that a $\overline{\nu}_\alpha \leftrightarrow \overline{\nu}_\beta$ system receives modifications to its effective oscillating parameters generally unlike those for a $\nu_\alpha \leftrightarrow \nu_\beta$ system in an identical medium.

III. OSCILLATIONS IN GRB PROGENITORS

Accompanying a merger/collapse event is the copious production of ν_e, ν_μ and ν_τ and their antiparticles, with mean energies ranging from ~ 10 to ~ 30 MeV. In this section, we

[2]Hereafter, we shall consider only two-neutrino systems.

shall examine the oscillations of these "active" neutrinos with (i) "sterile" neutrinos, and (ii) amongst themselves in GRB progenitors *per se*, adhering strictly only to laboratory bounds on the oscillation parameters. Constraints arising from cosmological circumstances such as big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) and closure will be noted at the appropriate points.

A. Active–sterile oscillations

We shall suppose here that each active flavour mixes with a sterile neutrino. The consideration of sterile neutrinos is well motivated for a number of reasons:

1. Right-handed neutrinos, which are sterile with respect to ordinary weak interactions, are necessary for a complete correspondence between lepton and quark degrees of freedom in the standard model of particle physics.

2. A particular class of light, effectively sterile fermions called "mirror neutrinos" arises if Improper Lorentz Transformations are retained as exact symmetries of Nature (see later).

3. Phenomenologically, they are strongly advocated through the need to resolve the apparent conflict between the three neutrino anomalies — solar [23], atmospheric [24] and LSND [25] — and the measured width of the Z^0 boson. The former in its entirety calls for an oscillation solution requiring at least four neutrinos, while the latter constrains the number of light active flavours to three.

Experiments performed thus far do not preclude the existence of yet more sterile species. Indeed, it is theoretically quite natural for the number of light sterile flavours to equal the number of quark and lepton generations, viz. three; this is our assumption for the rest of the paper. Furthermore, if the "sterile" flavours are identified with mirror neutrinos as in point 2 above, then they must come in triplicate. Thus our analysis here will also set the stage for the study of mirror stars in the next section.

1. Large mixing angle

Suppose that each active flavour ν_α exhibits large vacuum mixing with a sterile "partner" ν'_α, that is, $\cos 2\theta \approx 0$.[3] This is a most natural consequence from the perspective of model building, arising from the general Dirac–Majorana mass matrix for each generation of neutrinos,

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc} \overline{\nu}_L & \overline{(\nu_R)^c} \end{array}\right] \left(\begin{array}{cc} 0 & m \\ m & M \end{array}\right) \left[\begin{array}{c} (\nu_L)^c \\ \nu_R \end{array}\right], \tag{5}$$

[3]From here onwards, the symbol ν_s shall denote a generic sterile neutrino, while ν'_α is taken to mean the assigned sterile partner of ν_α, one for each of ν_e, ν_μ and ν_τ.

where the Dirac mass m is taken to be much larger than the right-handed neutrino Majorana mass M.[4] Upon diagonalisation, the two resulting pseudo-Dirac neutrinos, one of which we identify as the right-handed sterile neutrino, are essentially maximally mixed [26]. Pairwise maximal mixing also arises in the mirror matter model. Indeed, large amplitude pairwise oscillations of the active flavours into distinct sterile states are *a priori* necessary if *all* active $\nu\overline{\nu}$ annihilation in the baryon-contaminated mantle is to be prevented.

For this case of (almost) maximal mixing, matter effects are virtually identical for both neutrinos and antineutrinos by Eq. (3). From an inspection of the same equation, we identify two regions of interest:

$$\frac{\Delta m^2_{\alpha\alpha'}}{2E} \quad \begin{matrix} \ll \\ \gtrsim \end{matrix} \quad |V_{\alpha\alpha'}|\,, \tag{6}$$

where we have used $\sin 2\theta \approx 1$. These shall be labelled as the first and second conditions respectively. For convenience, we rewrite Eq. (6) in more accessible units,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Delta m^2_{ee'}}{E} \quad &\begin{matrix} \ll \\ \gtrsim \end{matrix} \quad \left| 760 \left(\frac{\rho}{10^{10}\ \mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}}} \right) (3Y_e - 1) \right| \frac{\mathrm{eV}^2}{\mathrm{MeV}} \qquad \text{for } \nu_e \leftrightarrow \nu'_e, \\ \frac{\Delta m^2_{\mu\mu',\,\tau\tau'}}{E} \quad &\begin{matrix} \ll \\ \gtrsim \end{matrix} \quad \left| 760 \left(\frac{\rho}{10^{10}\ \mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}}} \right) (Y_e - 1) \right| \frac{\mathrm{eV}^2}{\mathrm{MeV}} \qquad \text{for } \nu_{\mu,\,\tau} \leftrightarrow \nu'_{\mu,\,\tau}, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where the symbols are defined as for Eq. (4).[5]

In accordance with Eq. (3), the first condition corresponds to $\sin 2\theta_{\mathrm{eff}} \to 0$, implying that oscillations are strongly suppressed. Typically, the density of the resultant disk in a binary neutron star merger is at least $\rho \sim 10^9\ \mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}}$ with $Y_e \sim 0.02 \to 0.1$ [9], while that of the surrounding mantle in a collapse event is expected to be no less than $\rho \sim 10^6\ \mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}}$ with $Y_e \sim 0.2 \to 0.5$.[6] The SuperKamiokande results put the squared mass difference for $\nu_\mu \leftrightarrow \nu_x$, where ν_x is some as yet unidentified neutrino, at $10^{-3} \lesssim \Delta m^2/\mathrm{eV}^2 \lesssim 10^{-2}$ [14]. The corresponding upper bound for maximal $\nu_e \leftrightarrow \nu_x$ mixing is currently $\sim 10^{-3}\ \mathrm{eV}^2$ [28]. It follows from Eq. (7) that the average $10 \to 30$ MeV ν_e and ν_μ have virtually no chance of oscillating into a sterile species inside the baryonic region. Oscillations become more suppressed with the increase of neutrino energy. The formation of a dirty fireball therefore cannot be avoided with the introduction of $\nu_\mu \leftrightarrow \nu'_\mu$ or $\nu_e \leftrightarrow \nu'_e$ oscillations, which argues against the scenario of Ref. [15].

---

[4]Note that the zero in the top-left corner of the mass matrix is enforced by electroweak gauge invariance in the absence of weak-isospin triplet Higgs bosons.

[5]The presence of neutrinos contributes to the matter potentials in Eq. (4). However, we do not expect such a contribution to have too serious a consequence since the effective neutrino number density is generally small except near the neutrino emitting surface. In any case, the exclusion of the neutrino background should not alter the qualitative aspect of the present work.

[6]These numbers correspond to the density at $r \sim 300$ km and the number of electrons per nucleon, respectively, in a Type II supernova at ~ 0.6 s post bounce [27].

The second condition in Eq. (7) entails vacuum-like maximal oscillations. Taking the density of the neutrino emitting surface to be $\rho \sim 10^{11}\ \mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}}$, it is clear from Eq. (7) that matter effects remain unimportant in all or part of the baryonic region only for sub-keV ν_e and ν_μ. But these neutrinos are of little consequence; apart from inabundance, their energies are well below the threshold for e^-e^+ pair production.

At this stage, the acute reader would have noticed that in the case of core collapse, complete cancellation of matter effects for a $\nu_e \leftrightarrow \nu'_e$ system arises when $Y_e \approx 0.33$ by Eq. (7), where the effective mixing is temporarily vacuum-like and thus maximal. Substantial ν'_e's may be generated if such cancellation persists (approximately) over a distance comparable to the effective oscillation length of the system (i.e., the adiabatic condition — see later). Supposing that $\Delta m^2_{ee'} \sim 10^{-3}\ \mathrm{eV}^2$ and $E \sim 10$ MeV, Eq. (7) demands the change in Y_e in this region to be less than $\sim 10^{-4}$ even at a fixed density as low as $\rho \sim 10^6\ \mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}}$. Holding Y_e constant at, say, $0.33 + 10^{-10}$, the same equation requires that any deviation in density to be $< 10^5\ \mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}}$. However, given the dramatic rise and fall of Y_e and the density respectively in a mere few hundred kilometres, and that the oscillation length for the system concerned is ~ 25 km, the said conditions are unlikely to be satisfied across a region comparable to the latter. The production of ν'_e's is again suppressed, albeit by a different mechanism.

On the other hand, no laboratory upper bound on Δm^2 exists for maximal $\nu_\tau \leftrightarrow \nu'_\tau$ mixing. There are cosmological constraints from closure and big bang nucleosynthesis. The former yields an upper bound of about $40 \rightarrow 100$ eV for long lived neutrinos.[7] Supposing ν_τ to be much lighter than ν'_τ or vice versa, this condition effectively sets an upper limit of $\sim 10^4\ \mathrm{eV}^2$ on the squared mass difference. It transpires that if one pushes $\Delta m^2_{\tau\tau'}$ to the extreme, it is in fact possible to attain vacuum-like maximal ν_τ oscillations with its sterile partner even at a density of $\rho \sim 10^{10}\ \mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}}$, according to Eq. (7). The cost of an increased Δm^2, however, is the simultaneous shortening of the oscillation length. If the latter is to be comparable to the size of the baryonic region R and approximately maximal mixing is to be maintained throughout, then by Eqs. (3) and (6), the following condition must hold:

$$2\pi \gtrsim |V^{\max}_{\tau\tau'} R|\,, \tag{8}$$

or equivalently,

$$\left| \left(\frac{R}{\mathrm{km}}\right) \left(\frac{\rho_{\max}}{10^{10}\ \mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}}}\right) (Y_e - 1) \right| \lesssim 3.3 \times 10^{-6}, \tag{9}$$

where "max" denotes maximum beyond the neutrinosphere. Given that the average neutrino traverses a few kilometres of baryonic matter in a merger, not to mention the extent of the mantle in a collapse event, the reader can verify that Eq. (9) cannot be satisfied in any realistic GRB progenitor. Instead, the system undergoes rapid oscillations, as implied by its comparatively short oscillation length, quickly becoming, on average, an equal mixture

[7] Purported BBN constraints must be interpreted with care because important loopholes frequently exist. However, one can safely say that a maximally mixed active–sterile pair with a Δm^2 value in the range to be considered is disfavoured by BBN.

of ν_τ and ν'_τ (and their antiparticles) by Eq. (2). This scenario, however, is deemed unlikely for cosmological reasons mentioned earlier. But if some oscillations were to occur (perhaps with a smaller Δm^2), the ν_τ and $\overline{\nu}_\tau$ intensities at r would be, respectively, effectively halved such that $\nu_\tau \overline{\nu}_\tau$ annihilation would still take place inside the baryonic region, but at a quarter of the standard rate per unit volume. Assuming that all active flavours contribute equally to annihilation in the absence of oscillations, the total energy deposition rate in our case is expected to suffer at worst a 25 % decrease.

2. Small mixing angle

An interesting effect arises for propagation in a medium of monotonically varying density. A level-crossing occurs when the neutrinos traverse a region in which the effective masses are virtually degenerate, i.e., where the resonance condition

$$2EV_{\alpha\beta} = \Delta m^2_{\alpha\beta} \cos 2\theta, \tag{10}$$

is satisfied. Provided that the matter density is changing sufficiently slowly, a ν_α entering the resonance will emerge as a ν_β, where $\alpha \neq \beta$, and vice versa. This is the Mikheyev–Smirnov–Wolfenstein (MSW) effect [16,21] and is particularly prominent for $\sin 2\theta \sim 0$. The conversion efficiency depends on the ratio of the physical width of the resonance region to the corresponding effective oscillation length of the system, or equivalently,

$$\gamma \equiv \left. \frac{\left(\frac{\Delta m^2_{\alpha\beta}}{2E} \sin 2\theta \right)^2}{\left| \frac{dV_{\alpha\beta}}{dr} \right|} \right|_{\rm res}, \tag{11}$$

where $\frac{dV_{\alpha\beta}}{dr}$ is the rate of change of the matter potential along the neutrino's path. The larger the ratio (otherwise known as the adiabaticity parameter), the more effective the transformation.

Our interest in the case of small vacuum mixing lies in the possible existence of such a resonance within the baryonic region. If Eq. (10) is satisfied therein and the adiabaticity parameter γ is sufficiently large, the ensuing conversion of all active neutrinos to sterile species means that, beyond the resonance, no neutrinos are available for annihilation. This loss of energy is practically irretrievable, unless a second resonance exists through which steriles reconvert to actives.[8] The reduction in the total energy deposition rate hinges on the location of the resonance, since the $\nu\overline{\nu}$ annihilation rate per unit volume q generally has

[8]This situation is in fact not as contrived as it first seems. A double $\nu_e \leftrightarrow \nu_s$ resonance has been shown to exist in the post bounce hot bubble in a Type II supernova [19]. However, this possibility will not be dealt with here, owing to its extreme dependence on the density profile of the progenitor; the spatial distribution of baryons in a Type II supernova is perhaps not representative of those in core collapse scenarios in general.

an r-dependence, such as $q \propto r^{-8}$ for spherical geometry [29]. We leave this calculation for the interested numerical modeller.

We now explore the parameter space in which resonant conversion to sterile neutrinos would significantly decrease the energy deposition by $\nu\overline{\nu}$ annihilation, by calculating the constraints on the oscillation parameters required for the prevention of energy loss via this mechanism. Consider a binary neutron star merger, and let us suppose that each active species exhibits small mixing only with its sterile partner. Assuming that each ν'_α is lighter than its active counterpart, the extremely low value of Y_e in this environment means that the resonance condition can only be satisfied by antineutrino systems, as indicated by Eq. (4). Given the relevant densities, $\rho \sim 10^9 \to 10^{11}\ \mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}}$, the average $20 \to 30$ MeV (anti)neutrino will undergo resonant conversion if the squared mass difference of the oscillating system happens to lie in the approximate range

$$10^3 \lesssim \Delta m^2/\mathrm{eV}^2 \lesssim 10^5. \tag{12}$$

Furthermore, by holding the quantity Y_e constant, we rewrite the adiabaticity parameter in more civilised units,

$$\gamma = \frac{3}{\eta}\left[\left(\frac{\Delta m^2}{\mathrm{eV}^2}\right)\left(\frac{\mathrm{MeV}}{E}\right)\sin 2\theta\right]^2 \left(\frac{10^{10}\ \mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}\,km^{-1}}}{\left|\frac{d\rho}{dr}\right|}\right)\Bigg|_{\mathrm{res}}, \tag{13}$$

where $\eta = 1 - 3Y_e$ and $1 - Y_e$ for $\overline{\nu}_e \leftrightarrow \overline{\nu}'_e$ and $\overline{\nu}_{\mu,\,\tau} \leftrightarrow \overline{\nu}'_{\mu,\,\tau}$ respectively. One may reasonably expect the density gradient $\frac{d\rho}{dr}$ to be some undoubtedly highly model-dependent function of r. For our crude analysis, we make the approximation

$$\frac{d\rho}{dr} \approx \frac{\rho_{\max} - \rho_{\min}}{R} \sim \frac{10^{11}\ \mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}}}{10\ \mathrm{km}} = 10^{10}\ \mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}\,km^{-1}}. \tag{14}$$

If we demand $\gamma \ll 1$ such that resonant conversion to $\overline{\nu}_s$ is "non-adiabatic" and thus inefficient, then by Eqs. (13) and (14) together with $Y_e = 0.05$, the following approximate constraints on the vacuum mixing angle are obtained,

$$\sin^2 2\theta \ll 10^{-4} \to 10^{-8}, \tag{15}$$

for the range of squared mass differences in Eq. (12), where we have taken the neutrino energy to be the average $20 \to 30$ MeV intrinsic to binary neutron star mergers.

B. Active–active oscillations

In the following, we briefly examine the consequences of mixing amongst the active flavours.

Oscillations between ν_μ and ν_τ are not affected by the presence of matter, since they interact similarly with ordinary matter. For the same reason, these thermal neutrinos are produced with identical energy spectra and are therefore of little interest from the perspective of $\nu_\mu \leftrightarrow \nu_\tau$ oscillations.

Contrastingly, the $\nu_e \leftrightarrow \nu_{\mu,\tau}$ system may experience resonant conversion, given the correct oscillation parameters. Since ν_e's are more abundant, this implies a possible decrease in the ν_e flux beyond the resonance. However, as the more energetic $\nu_{\mu,\tau}$'s are simultaneously converted to ν_e's, one may reasonably expect the reduction in flux to be compensated for by a harder spectrum. Similarly, the increase in $\nu_{\mu,\tau}$ flux is accompanied by a softening of the spectrum. Thus, summing over all flavours, the energy deposition rate due to $\nu\overline{\nu}$ annihilation should, to a first approximation, exhibit minimal difference from the no-oscillation case.

IV. MIRROR STARS

The concept of a mirror world was introduced as a means to retain parity and time-reversal transformations (Improper Lorentz Transformations) as exact symmetries of Nature. In essence, the content of the Standard Model of particle physics is enlarged to include a mirror sector such that every ordinary particle is partnered with a mirror image differing only in its handedness. The resulting theory has been called the Exact Parity Model [30] (see also Ref. [31] for a different model). These particles participate in mirror interactions identical in nature to ordinary processes, but are inert with respect to the ordinary strong, electromagnetic and weak forces. Thus the mirror world evolves as we do, complete with stellar mergers and collapses, its only link to the ordinary world being through gravitational coupling, and the mixing of colourless and electrically neutral ordinary–mirror partners. If neutrinos have non-degenerate masses, maximal ordinary–mirror neutrino oscillations are a necessary consequence of the underlying exact parity symmetry. Interestingly, the maximal mixing of ν_e with its mirror partner can solve the solar neutrino problem, while the maximal mixing of ν_μ with *its* mirror partner can solve the atmospheric neutrino problem [32].

Recently, Blinnikov has proposed that the central engines of GRBs may be cataclysmic astrophysical events involving mirror stars [20]. We now examine the implications of matter-affected neutrino oscillations for this proposal.

Mirror neutrinos emitted in a mirror merger/collapse must traverse a region of excess mirror baryons and suffer the same matter effects as do their ordinary counterparts. Thus interactions between mirror neutrinos and the mirror ambience are equally well described by the matter potentials written down earlier in Eq. (4), save for a change of labels — α becomes α', where the primed symbol now denotes a mirror particle. In this environment, our ordinary ν_e, ν_μ and ν_τ are effectively what were previously labelled as sterile neutrinos.

Given that the $\nu\overline{\nu}$ annihilation rate per unit volume generally decreases with r, in order to channel as much energy as possible towards the generation of an *ordinary* GRB, rapid maximal ordinary–mirror oscillations for both neutrinos and antineutrinos throughout the progenitor is desired. However, as suggested by results from the previous section, this situation cannot be realised by the $\nu_e \leftrightarrow \nu'_e$ and $\nu_\mu \leftrightarrow \nu'_\mu$ systems for which oscillations are highly suppressed at the nominal densities. Pushing the squared mass differences to their respective upper limits, substantial mixing is possible at densities lower than $\rho \sim 10^3 \rightarrow 10^4\ \mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}}$ by Eq. (7). But the annihilation of ordinary neutrinos will now take place at large distances where the rate is rendered insignificant by geometric factors. As an illustration, suppose that the progenitor is spherical and that ordinary ν_e and $\overline{\nu}_e$ are available in large quantities only at $r > r_0$ where mixing is not suppressed. We estimate the efficiency of the

energy deposition due to $\nu_e\overline{\nu}_e$ annihilation to be

$$\frac{\dot{Q}_{e\overline{e}}}{\dot{Q}^{\rm ord}_{e\overline{e}}} \simeq \frac{L_e L_{\overline{e}} \int_{r_0}^{\infty} r^{-8} r^2 dr}{L_e^{\rm ord} L_{\overline{e}}^{\rm ord} \int_{r_\nu}^{\infty} r^{-8} r^2 dr} = \frac{L_e L_{\overline{e}}}{L_e^{\rm ord} L_{\overline{e}}^{\rm ord}} \left(\frac{r_0}{r_\nu}\right)^{-5}, \tag{16}$$

where $\dot{Q}$ is the integrated energy deposition rate, L_e and $L_{\overline{e}}$ are the effective luminosities of ν_e and $\overline{\nu}_e$ respectively, r_ν the radius of the emitting surface, and the subscript "ord" denotes ordinary. Equation (16) clearly demonstrates that a distance as small as $r_0 \approx 4r_\nu$ is enough to produce at least a thousand-fold decrease in the efficiency (since $L_\alpha \leq L_\alpha^{\rm ord}$). Thus ordinary $\nu_e\overline{\nu}_e$ and $\nu_\mu\overline{\nu}_\mu$ annihilation in a mirror event may be safely ignored.

Conversely, the $\nu_\tau \leftrightarrow \nu'_\tau$ system may at least partially fulfil the aforementioned requirements, if $\Delta m^2_{\tau\tau'}$ is sufficiently large for maximal mixing to be attained not too far from the neutrinosphere (with the usual caveats regarding possible cosmological constraints understood). Be this the case, rapid maximal oscillations will lead to the effective generation of a ν_τ and a $\overline{\nu}_\tau$ flux, each with a luminosity equal to half of that expected from an ordinary merger/collapse. This implies that the energy deposition rate per unit volume at r is a factor of four smaller than that due to $\nu_\tau\overline{\nu}_\tau$ annihilation alone in an ordinary event. In the standard picture, all three active flavours contribute roughly equal amounts of energy towards the burst. It follows that the total annihilation rate per unit volume at r must be some ten times less than the ordinary rate. Furthermore, that ordinary annihilation only takes place at $r > r_0$ introduces a geometric reduction factor. Thus, assuming spherical geometry, we estimate the overall efficiency of energy deposition to be

$$\frac{\dot{Q}_{\rm total}}{\dot{Q}^{\rm ord}_{\rm total}} \simeq \frac{\dot{Q}_{\tau\overline{\tau}}}{\sum_{\alpha=e,\,\mu,\,\tau} \dot{Q}^{\rm ord}_{\alpha\overline{\alpha}}} \simeq \frac{L_\tau L_{\overline{\tau}}}{\sum_{\alpha=e,\,\mu,\,\tau} L_\alpha^{\rm ord} L_{\overline{\alpha}}^{\rm ord}} \left(\frac{r_0}{r_\nu}\right)^{-5} \simeq \frac{1}{10}\left(\frac{r_0}{r_\nu}\right)^{-5}, \tag{17}$$

where the assumption $r_{\nu_e} \approx r_{\overline{\nu}_e} \approx \cdots \approx r_{\nu_\tau} \equiv r_\nu$ is implicit. As an illustration, the matter density in a core collapse is such that a $\nu_\tau \leftrightarrow \nu'_\tau$ system with $\Delta m^2 \sim 10$ eV^2 may enjoy maximal mixing beyond $r_0 \sim 2r_\nu$.[9] Thus a GRB generated by such a mirror event must be approximately 300 times less energetic than one produced by an equivalent event in the ordinary world. The reward, however, is that the baryon-loading problem is virtually eliminated.

We shall not consider small angle resonant conversion of mirror to ordinary neutrinos since this process is generally not simultaneously available for both neutrinos and antineutrinos. Ordinary annihilation necessarily requires the presence of both ν and $\overline{\nu}$. Thus small mixing between mirror partners alone will not lead to the production of ordinary GRBs in mirror events.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Matter-affected neutrino oscillations in GRB progenitors are studied in this paper. For simplicity, all oscillation schemes examined are essentially independent two-neutrino sys-

[9] These numbers are inferred from Figure 1b in Ref. [19] for a Type II supernova at ~ 6 s post bounce.

tems. It is found that oscillations amongst the ordinary, active flavours — ν_e, ν_μ and ν_τ — have minimal effects on the energetics of the burst. Maximal ν_e and ν_μ oscillations with their respective sterile partners are also expected to be of little consequence. Contrastingly, if ν_τ is allowed to oscillate maximally to its sterile partner with a squared mass difference $\Delta m^2 \gtrsim 10^4$ eV^2, the energy available for the ultimate GRB may suffer a 25 % decrease. However, reconciliation with constraints imposed by cosmological closure and big bang nucleosynthesis renders this option unlikely.

In the small mixing angle regime, the possible existence of an MSW resonance in the baryonic region implies a generally irretrievable loss of energy beyond the resonance in the form of sterile neutrinos. By demanding minimal loss, we are able to determine some crude constraints on the oscillation parameters. These can be found in the appropriate section in the paper.

Contrary to earlier claims, matter effects alter the oscillation pattern in such a way that the "temporary" conversion to ν_s as a means to bypass the baryonic region cannot be achieved in any realistic GRB progenitor. The fireball will remain as dirty as dictated by the merger/collapse.

The suppression of mirror to ordinary neutrino oscillations by matter effects also argues against the viability of mirror mergers/collapses as *ordinary* GRB progenitors. Even the most efficient $\nu_\tau \leftrightarrow \nu'_\tau$ maximal oscillations with $\Delta m^2 \gtrsim 10^4$ eV^2 would lead to some factor of ten decrease in the energy of the resultant burst relative to that generated by an equivalent event in the ordinary world. Further deterioration inevitably follows, at least in the case of spherical geometry, any decrease in the squared mass difference. Ultimately, the central mirror engine will perhaps need to be a few hundred (or more) times more energetic than its ordinary counterpart if it is to produce an ordinary GRB that is compatible in energy with observations. However, with the guaranteed elimination of the baryon-loading problem, this remains an option.

We stress at this point that the study of matter-affected oscillations is highly model-dependent — the word "model" referring to both the GRB and the neutrino model. Analyses of two-neutrino systems merely serve to illustrate some of the possible effects. But most importantly, we wish to emphasise the necessity to consider matter effects on the oscillation pattern, if neutrinos are to be the means of energy transportation in any GRB progenitor. At this stage, there is no clear evidence for the correct GRB or neutrino model. Hopefully, with new neutrino experiments underway, the latter will be at least partially resolved in the not too distant future.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by the Australian Research Council and in part by the Commonwealth of Australia's postgraduate award scheme.

REFERENCES

[1] For a review on gamma-ray bursts, see T. Piran, astro-ph/9810256; P. Mészáros, astro-ph/9904038.

[2] B. Paczyński, Astrophys. J. Lett. **308**, L43 (1986); J. Goodman, *ibid.* **308**, L47 (1986); A. Shemi and T. Piran, *ibid.* **365**, L55 (1990); J. H. Krolik and E. A. Pier, Astrophys. J. **373**, 277 (1991).

[3] R. Narayan, B. Paczyński and T. Piran, Astrophys. J. Lett. **395**, L83 (1992); M. J. Rees and P. Mészáros, *ibid.* **430**, L93, (1994); B. Paczyński and G. Xu, Astrophys. J. **427**, 709 (1994).

[4] B. Paczyński and J. E. Rhoads, Astrophys. J. Lett. **418**, L5 (1993); P. Mészáros and M. J. Rees, *ibid.* **482**, L28 (1997); M. Vietri, *ibid.* **478**, L9 (1997); J. I. Katz, Astrophys. J. **422**, 248 (1994); R. Sari and T. Piran, *ibid.* **485**, 270 (1997) .

[5] E. Costa *et al.*, Nature **387**, 783 (1997); J. van Paradijs *et al.*, *ibid.* **386**, 686 (1997); D. A. Frail *et al.*, *ibid.* **389**, 261 (1997).

[6] For a dissenting view, see for instance A. Dar, Astrophys. J. Lett. **500**, L93 (1998).

[7] M. R. Metzger *et al.*, Nature **387**, 878 (1997); S. Kulkarni *et al.*, *ibid.* **393**, 35 (1998).

[8] C. W. Akerlof *et al.*, GCN **205** (1999); Nature (1999), in press; S. Kulkarni *et al.*, Nature (1999), in press; astro-ph/9902272.

[9] S. I. Blinnikov, I. D. Novikov, T. V. Perevodchikova and A. G. Polnarev, Soviet Astronomy Letters **10**, 177 (1984); D. Eichler, M. Livio, T. Piran and D. N. Schramm, Nature **340**, 126 (1989); see also H.-Th. Janka and M. Ruffert, Astro. Astrophys. Lett. **307**, L33 (1996); M. Ruffert, H.-Th. Janka, K. Takahashi and G. Schäfer, Astro. Astrophys. **319**, 122 (1997).

[10] See, for example, C. L. Fryer and S. E. Woosley, Astrophys. J. Lett. **502**, L9 (1998); W. H. Lee and W. Kluźniak, astro-ph/9903488.

[11] See, for example, G. M. Fuller and X. Shi, Astrophys. J. Lett. **502**, L5 (1998); A. Dar, B. Z. Kozlovsky, S. Nussinov and R. Ramaty, Astrophys. J. **388**, 164 (1992); S. E. Woosley, *ibid.* **405**, 273 (1993); B. Paczyński, astro-ph/9706232; astro-ph/9712123.

[12] V. S. Berezinsky and O. F. Prilutsky, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center Intern. Cosmic Ray Conf., Vol. 1 p29 - 32; Astro. Astrophys. **175**, 309 (1987).

[13] R. D. Blandford and R. L. Znajek, MNRAS **179**, 433 (1977).

[14] SuperKamiokande Collaboration, Y. Fukada *et al.*, hep-ex/9803006; hep-ex/9805006; hep-ex/9807003.

[15] W. Kluźniak, Astrophys. J. Lett. **508**, L29 (1998).

[16] S. P. Mikheyev and A. Yu. Smirnov, Nuovo Cimento C **9**, 17 (1986).

[17] R. Foot, M. J. Thomson and R. R. Volkas, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 5349 (1996); X. Shi, *ibid.* **54**, 2753 (1996); R. Foot and R. R. Volkas, *ibid.* **55**, 5147 (1997); *ibid.* **56**, 6653 (1997) and Erratum *ibid.* **59**, 029901 (1999); Astropart. Phys. **7**, 283 (1997); N. F. Bell, R. Foot and R. R. Volkas, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 105010 (1998); N. F. Bell, R. R. Volkas and Y. Y. Y. Wong, *ibid.* **59**, 113001 (1999); R. Foot, Astropart. Phys. **10**, 253 (1999); R. Foot and R. R. Volkas, hep-ph/9904336.

[18] G. M. Fuller, R. Mayle, B. S. Meyer and J. R. Wilson, Astrophys. J. **389**, 517 (1992); Y.-Z. Qian, G. M. Fuller, G. J. Mathews, R. W. Mayle, J. R. Wilson and S. E. Woosley,

Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 1965 (1993); Y.-Z. Qian and G. M. Fuller, Phys Rev. D **51**, 1479 (1995); *ibid.* **52**, 656 (1995); G. Sigl, *ibid.* **51**, 4035 (1995).
[19] H. Nunokawa, J. T. Peltoniemi, A. Rossi and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 1704 (1997).
[20] S. Blinnikov, astro-ph/9902305.
[21] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D **17**, 2369 (1978); **20**, 2634 (1979).
[22] For a review on matter effects on neutrino oscillations, see T. K. Kuo and J. Pantaleone, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 937 (1989).
[23] K. Lande (for the Homestake Collaboration), in *Neutrino'98*, Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Neutrino Physics and Astrophysics, Takayama, Japan, edited by Y. Suzuki and Y. Totsuka, to be published in Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.); GALLEX Collaboration, P. Anselmann *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **342**, 440 (1995); W. Hampel *et al.*, *ibid.* **338**, 364 (1996); SAGE Collaboration, V. Gavrin *et al.*, in *Neutrino'98*; Y. Suzuki (for the SuperKamiokande Collaboration), *ibid.*.
[24] See Ref. [14] and T. Haines *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 1986 (1986); Kamiokande Collaboration, K. S. Hirata *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **205**, 416 (1988); **280**, 146 (1992); Y. Fukada *et al.*, *ibid.* **335**, 237 (1994); IMB Collaboration, D. Casper *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 2561 (1989); R. Becker-Szendy *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 3720 (1989); Soudan 2 Collaboration, W. W. M. Allison *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **391**, 491 (1997).
[25] LSND Collaboration, C. Athanassopoulos *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett **75**, 2650 (1995); **77**, 3982 (1996); nucl-ex/9706006.
[26] See for example, J. P. Bowes and R. R. Volkas, J. Phys. G **24**, 1249 (1998); A. Geiser, Phys. Lett. B **444**, 358 (1999); P. Langacker, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 093017 (1998); Y. Koide and H. Fusaoka, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 053004 (1999); Z. Chacko and R. N. Mohapatra, hep-ph/9905388; C. Giunti *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 3034 (1992); S. M. Bilenky and S. T. Petcov, Rev. Mod. Phys. **59**, 671 (1987).
[27] R. W. Mayle and J. R. Wilson, in *Supernovae*, Proceedings of the Tenth Santa Cruz Summer Workshop, edited by S. E. Woosley, (Springer Verlag, New York), p.333 (1991).
[28] CHOOZ Collaboration, M. Apollonio *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **420**, 397 (1998).
[29] J. Goodman, A. Dar and S. Nussinov, Astrophys. J. Lett. **314**, L7 (1987).
[30] R. Foot, H. Lew and R. R. Volkas, Phys. Lett. B **272**, 67 (1991); see also the concluding section of: T. D. Lee and C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. **104**, 254 (1956).
[31] Z. G. Berezhiani and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 6607 (1995); Z. G. Berezhiani, A. D. Dolgov and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Lett. B **375**, 26 (1996).
[32] R. Foot and R. R. Volkas, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 6595 (1995); R. Foot, H Lew and R. R. Volkas, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **7**, 2567 (1992); R. Foot, *ibid.* **9**, 169 (1994).